UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/804,503	03/19/2004	Che-Hsiung Hsu	PE0673USCIP1	7680		
23906 F. I. D. I. PONT	7590 04/03/200 DE NEMOURS AND	EXAM	EXAMINER			
LEGAL PATE	NT RECORDS CENT	SANDERS, KRIELLION ANTIONETTE				
BARLEY MIL 4417 LANCAS	L PLAZA 25/1128 STER PIKE	•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
WILMINGTO	N, DE 19805	. 1714				
SHORTENED STATUTOR	RY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVER	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MC	NTHS	04/03/2007	DAT	DADCD		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	,	Applica	tion No.	Applicant(s)	· ·			
		10/804,	503	HSU, CHE-HSIUI	HSU, CHE-HSIUNG			
Office Action Summary			er	Art Unit				
		Kriellion	A. Sanders	1714				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communic or Reply	ation appears on t	he cover sheet with th	e correspondence ad	ddress			
WHIC - External after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FO CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MA nsions of time may be available under the provisions of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this community of period for reply is specified above, the maximum stature to reply within the set or extended period for reply we reply received by the Office later than three months after the part of the provision of the pro	ILING DATE OF 7 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no onication. Itory period will apply and III, by statute, cause the a	THIS COMMUNICATI event, however, may a reply be will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fro oplication to become ABANDO	ON. The timely filed Tom the mailing date of this one The mailing date of this one of the control of the contro				
Status		•						
1)⊠:	Responsive to communication(s) filed	on						
		o)⊠ This action is	non-final					
3)								
-/	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	ion of Claims		,,					
· _		42 ioloro pondina	in the application					
	Claim(s) 2-14,16-25,27-33,35-41 and 43 is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
·	☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. ☑ Claim(s) 2-14 16-25 27-33 and 35-41 and 43 is/are rejected.							
7)								
8)								
,	•	on analor election	·					
Applicati —	ion Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.								
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.								
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
•	Acknowledgment is made of a claim fo ☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:		·	(a)-(d) or (f).				
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).								
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
Attachmen	t(s)							
1) 🔲 Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) 🔲 Interview Summ					
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT	O-948)	Paper No(s)/Mai		·			
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application 6) Other:								
- 1, -	·		- ·					

Art Unit: 1714

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/11/07 has been entered.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130 (b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 2-14, 16-25, 27-33 and 35-41 and 43 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of **obviousness-type** double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-26 of copending U.S. Patent Application No. 10/669,422, which is equivalent to Patent Publication No.

Art Unit: 1714

2004/0124504; and claims 2, 4-17, and 20-23 of copending U.S. Patent Application No. 10/670,670 now allowed. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both inventions encompass and claim aqueous dispersions of an electrically conductive organic polymer and a plurality of nanoparticles.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 9/13/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. There is clear overlap between the present and copending inventions. It would have been obvious to select an inorganic or an organic nanoparticle from the claimed invention of the copending applications.

The rejection under the judicially created doctrine of **obviousness-type** double patenting over U.S. Patent Application No. 10/669,422 and 10/670,670 is withdrawn in view of applicant's comments.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kriellion A. Sanders whose telephone number is 571-272-1122. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 6:30-7:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on 571-272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1714

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kriellion A. Sanders Primary Examiner Art Unit 1714